

REMARKS

Claims 1-16 were examined in the outstanding final office action mailed on 08/16/2006 (hereafter "Outstanding Office Action"). All the claims were rejected. By virtue of this amendment, claims 1, 2, 5, 9, 13 and 14 are sought to be amended to clearly define the invention. The amendments are believed not to introduce new subject matter, and their entry is respectfully requested. The amendments are made without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 1-16 are thus respectfully presented for reconsideration.

Examiner Interview

As noted above, a telephone interview was conducted on November 07, 2006 with only Examiners Syed and Mofiz, and the undersigned representative attending. The undersigned representative pointed out technical differences of the subject matter of the patent application from U.S. Patent number 6,571,235 B1 issued to Marpe *et al* (hereinafter as "Marpe"). Suggestions of specific claim amendments which would overcome the 102 rejections of records were also discussed and are believed to be reflected in the foregoing amendments.

The applicant is believed to have met the burden of making of record the Substance of the Interview. The Examiner is also requested to send a duly completed Examiner Interview Summary form PTOL-413 if one has not been sent already. See MPEP 713.04 for further details.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Marpe in the Outstanding Office Action. The rejections are believed to be rendered moot in view of the foregoing amendments, at least for reasons explained below.

Currently amended claim 1 recites "... said first database is designed to be accessed using a second interface implemented in a second client system but not implemented in said first client system, ... enabling said user to specify said first database as a database of interest and a search criteria ... sending said search criteria to said second client;...".

Thus, a first client system which may not be able to directly access a first database sends the search criteria to a second client which can access the first database, and receives the results of the search query. Marpe clearly does not disclose such a feature.

Accordingly currently amended independent claim 1 is believed to be allowable over the art of record. Independent claim 13 is also believed to be allowable for at least some of similar reasons.

Dependent claims 2-4 and 14-16 are allowable at least as depending from respective base claims 1 and 13.

Currently amended claim 5 recites, "... implementing a first plurality of procedures according to a first interface, wherein said first plurality of procedures are implemented on a second client system ..., wherein said first plurality of procedures enable retrieval of desired data from a first database accessible from said second client system; and means for access which can be instantiated from said new user application executing on a said first client system which cannot access data in said first database, ... wherein said means for access enables a user to specify said first database and a search query, wherein said means for access uses said first plurality of procedures implemented in said second client system according to said first interface to retrieve data matching said query."

Thus the first plurality of procedures according to a first interface are implemented on a second client system, which can access a first database. The means for access can then be instantiated by a user application on a first client system which cannot access data in the first database. The means for access enables the user to specify the first database and a search question, and uses the first plurality of procedures according to the first interface to retrieve data matching the query.

Marpe again does not disclose such a feature. Accordingly, independent claim 5 is allowable over the art of record. Independent claim 9 is also believed to be allowable for at least some of similar reasons.

Dependent claims 6-8 and 10-12 are allowable at least as depending from respective base claims 5 and 9.

Conclusion

Accordingly all the objections and rejections of record are believed to be overcome.
Continuation of examination is respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned representative at 707.356.4172 if it is believed that an interview might be useful for any reason.

5

Date: November 14, 2006

Respectfully submitted,
/Narendra Reddy Thappeta/

Signature

Printed Name: Narendra Reddy Thappeta
Attorney for Applicant
Registration Number: 41,416